

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 28 (legislative day of October 25), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

PENNSYLVANIA

Marjorie Lowery, Boston.
Amidee T. Seese, Markleysburg.
Emma J. Roof, Monroeton.
Harry C. Mickie, New Paris.
Esther Smith, Renton.
Alice B. Smith, Shawnee on Delaware.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend George H. Moore, pastor of the Main Street Baptist Church, Greenwood, S. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we come to Thee because Thou hast invited us to come boldly to a throne of grace and find grace to help in time of need. We are ever in need of Thee. We come now asking for wisdom from above. We would not lean upon our own understanding, but lean upon the One who is omnipotent, omniscient, who knows the end from the beginning.

We pray that Thou wilt bless this Nation. May the leaders look to Thee and follow Thee—may all Thy people humble themselves, pray, turn from wicked ways and seek Thy face, so that Thou canst bless. Make us a truly Christian nation, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Make us an instrument through which Thou canst bless the world.

In this world of strife, bloodshed, and hatred, may the nations come to know that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Turn the hearts of the people to Thee, that there may be peace.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include an address given by Mrs. R. M. Kiefer, secretary-manager, National Association of Retail Grocers at the National Food Conference, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill., September 17, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LET US INVESTIGATE BEFORE WE TAX

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, let us investigate our Federal Bureaus, find out which are needed, and which are not needed—how many people can be removed from the Federal pay roll, without hindering our war effort—determine how much money is absolutely needed, before we burden the people with addi-

tional taxes, and pour more money into the Federal Treasury. Experience has proven to me, that if you give Federal bureaus and departments the money, they will spend it. So, let us see if they actually need any more money and if so, how much. A few months ago, the President said, we had to have \$16,000,000,000 more revenue—a few weeks ago, \$12,000,000,000—a few days ago, his spokesman, Secretary Morgenthau said, \$10,500,000,000. So let us wait a few more weeks, and investigate, and probably we will not need any more. I believe that reduction in our expenditures, without hindering our war effort, can be made and should be made. May I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to just a few of our expenditures. Travel cost for the executive branch alone—not including the War and Navy Departments—for 1943 will exceed \$100,000,000.

The O. W. I.—Office of War Information—will require better than \$50,000,000 this year to maintain their program—for what—hindering the press—suppressing one of our freedoms? The functions of this Bureau can be handled by our military departments, who would see to it, that nothing of military value to our enemy would be made public. The American people do not need the O. W. I. propaganda program.

In the last fiscal year the Federal Government spent approximately \$30,000,000—excluding War and Navy Departments—for communication, almost \$8,000,000 was spent for telephone calls alone.

We have 12 regional credit corporations, whose duties duplicate wholly or in part the lending activities of 19 other Federal lending agencies. Why cannot a large part of these agencies be merged to cut out overhead, stop duplication, and save manpower.

One Federal loaning agency alone has 47 State offices, 275 district offices, 2,315 county offices; it employs 15,960 people with an annual pay roll of \$30,000,000. Despite its widespread central offices, this agency alone spent \$28,000,000 in traveling expenses. In other words, this one agency spent enough in traveling expenses to pay coach fare from Washington to San Francisco and return for every one of its employees 18 times a year. This one agency's cost was \$1 for every three it loaned.

The Office of O. P. A. alone issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, excluding rationing forms and instructions. One company estimated such forms and instructions required 132,560 man-hours and \$192,500 to prepare Government-required information.

A conservative estimate would be that 188,000 persons prepare data for the Government, excluding of course, rationing work. I believe that at least 60 percent of these required reports can be eliminated.

The Civil Service Commission frequently sends "experts" to my district, recruiting more employees for the Government's already overcrowded pay roll. These representatives or experts are paid their salaries, plus \$6 a day ex-

penses, plus railroad—Pullman—transportation.

One manufacturer who has just recently signed a contract with the Government, found that in order to fulfill the contract legally, he would have to make out more than 22,000 separate invoices and billings, and that each of those forms would have to be made out with 23 carbon copies, 1 carbon copy to be filed in each of the 23 different Government agencies. That means that 23 different file clerks must file the same invoice in 23 duplicate files; 23 Government clerks must go through the same duplicating procedure of reading and digesting the information thereon. All that, at a time when the newspapers of the Nation are being cut down in the size of the newspapers they are allowed to print because of a paper shortage, and all that at a time when we are hearing from every side about the critical manpower shortage.

It is not my desire to prevent the necessary departments from having everything they need to carry on the war; but inefficiency and waste has never yet won a war. There definitely is a tremendous amount of waste and unnecessary expenditure, and the production and purchase of unnecessary goods, and the hiring of thousands of totally unnecessary people in our Government agencies. Why is it that the United States is spending more money on this war than all of our allies combined? Why this swarm of Federal employees, these unnecessary rules and expenditures which are increasing our taxes, while we preach economy and sacrifice?

The people are willing to pay for every gun, every bullet, every plane, bomb, tank, cargo vessel, and warship, and all the food needed to supply our troops, and anything else that is needed, and to provide our share of the supplies to our allies. We are ready to spend any amount of money actually needed to save a single life or shorten the war one minute, but we want these expenditures to be based upon actual needs, and not upon mere unfounded recommendations.

I agree with the President, when he said that "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man, woman, and child who labors." But, we as a people, should not be made victims of such extravagance as we now have, which calls for unnecessary taxation. I, therefore, call upon the President, the leaders of this administration, and every Member of Congress, to exert every conscientious effort to save the requested \$10,500,000,000, instead of directing energies toward plans calling for additional tax burdens to be placed upon our American citizenry. Let us again reflect the thrift and common sense of our forefathers who founded this country. Let us all be champions of economy and good judgment, and enemies of extravagance and waste.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had today to address the House for 10 minutes may be extended to 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from a resolution passed by the Mississippi Valley Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a resolution of the Mississippi Valley Association on the subject of aviation and in the other to include an article which appeared in the local papers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix on two subjects, to include in one an editorial that appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Monday, October 25, 1943, and in the other to include a resolution submitted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission adopted at the annual meeting held at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 23 and 24, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address made by me on October 4.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent address by the Honorable Sumner Welles before a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article which I prepared on the work of Carlos Finlay, I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer advising me that it would make three and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of \$157.50. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein a letter and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a resolution I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LAMBERTSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders previously entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes, and following that, that the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and, another request, that I may be permitted to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by David Lawrence under date of October 6.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, if the House is in session, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OIL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, oil is the lifeblood of the whole military machine of this country and every other country.

Oil is an exhaustible resource.

Possession of oil reserves and oil resources on the one hand—or the lack of them on the other—may fundamentally influence the course of history and the position of the nations in the future. Control of the petroleum industry within this Nation constitutes something mighty close to supreme economic power.

Yet no natural resource has ever been more effectively controlled by powerful monopolistic interests than the oil of our own country. Those interests have through the years largely "written their own ticket" so far as their relationship to the Government and people of the United States has been concerned. Times have not changed.

ELK HILLS

Five months ago some of us spoke out in protest against the contract entered into the previous November between the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California with regard to the Elk Hills naval oil reserve. Under the terms of that contract the Navy could have obtained not one drop of its own oil from its own reserve as long as the war lasted—or for 5 years, whichever was longer—without buying it from the Standard Oil Co. It is not my purpose today to review the arguments or the events which led to the cancellation of that contract only a few days after the first public protest against it was made here in the House on May 21, 1943. Suffice it to say the contract was canceled. For the reasons for that cancellation I refer you to the unrefuted testimony of Assistant Attorney General Norman Littell before the Public Lands Committee.

But the fundamental issue and question of policy with regard to Elk Hills reserve has not been decided. Standard Oil of California is still operating the field under an interim agreement with the Navy Department. That agreement became effective September 8 and runs for 90 days, which means that before December 7 the permanent policy with regard to this, the greatest oil reserve on earth, save only one, must be decided.

Standard Oil owns about one-third of the Elk Hills field. That third has been heavily drilled and exploited. The people of the United States, and specifically the Navy, own the other two-thirds of the field, including the portion least exploited. The problem has been to conserve the Navy's oil so as to assure, so far as possible, the supply for future defense of our country. But this has been impossible so long as Standard's wells drilled along the borders of Navy's section continued to draw the oil from those sections.

Two general courses can be followed. Either the whole Elk Hills reserve can be turned over to the Standard Oil Co. which owns one-third of it, to be operated under the terms of some sort of contract, or else the one-third holdings of the Standard Oil Co. can be purchased by the Navy which owns the two-thirds, and the whole field made into the real oil reserve which it ought to be and which Congress intended it to be.

This is the greatest oil reserve, so far as we know, that our Navy has or ever can have. It ought to be managed as a true reserve. That simply cannot be done unless it belongs to the Navy—the whole of it.

The signing of a contract giving Standard Oil a monopoly of exploitation and development and operation of this field is apparently the only other alternative. If such a contract were anything like the original one, the advantages to the oil company and the possible loss to the American people would be enormous. And the whole reserve would be subject to the chance that a long succession of Secretaries of the Navy would be wise, resourceful, and incorruptible enough to keep abreast of one of the two or three tightest, most powerful organizations of any sort—political, military, religious, or industrial—that the world has ever seen.

Never in my discussion of this question have I suggested that there was any lack of honor or honesty or good faith on anyone's part. I do not do so now.

But I cannot fail to warn the Congress and the Nation that the danger is not past of another contract being made which will pass the test of technical legality—which the original one did not—but which will deliver Elk Hills over to the Standard Oil's operation and control just the same.

Oil in the ground is a gift of God to the American people—to the whole people. Elk Hills ought to belong, in toto, to the American people. The Navy ought to purchase, by condemnation if necessary, the holdings of Standard Oil in that field. For that is the only way it can protect the oil it already owns under its own land. No other solution is fair to the American people. None other can protect their future. This Congress ought to require such a policy to be followed.

Our Navy Department has acquired close to a million acres of land since the war began. I do not criticize these acquisitions, believing them to have been made due to the necessity of the war program in the defense of our country. It appears, however, that the largest amount of land acquired in any single State has been in California. A considerable portion of the water front in the city of Oakland was acquired by the Navy Department, and other pieces of land, in some cases very large ones, have been acquired for such purposes as ship facilities, naval air stations, housing, the construction of roads, the building of ammunition depots, sewage disposal, water supply, and access rail and power lines. My only question is, If it was fit-

ting and proper, as I believe it was, for our Navy to acquire these holdings of land, why should we hesitate when we are confronted by that admittedly formidable organization, the Standard Oil Co. of California?

Only when the whole Elk Hills field belongs to the American people through their Navy will the Navy's one greatest reserve of its lifeblood—oil—be secure.

DIRECTIVE NO. 70

I now come to a discussion of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued by the Petroleum Administration for War under date of September 24, 1943, and published in the Federal Register for Wednesday, October 13, on page 13983.

Very little public discussion has been had of this directive. I do not believe it has been mentioned at all in the Congress and only one newspaper so far as I am aware has carried any considerable discussion of it.

The O. W. I., for example, made only the following brief mention of Directive No. 70:

Foreign operations of American oil companies during the war emergency will be more completely coordinated under the terms of Petroleum Directive No. 70 issued today by Petroleum Administrator for War Ickes.

The many important considerations to the future of the American oil industry and, indeed, the American people as a whole which were omitted by this O. W. I. announcement will be clear as I go along.

Under the terms of this directive, the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War is given the power to investigate and determine the petroleum requirements of each foreign country or area to be supplied and to prepare and submit to the Director allocation schedules for each such country or area. This committee is also empowered to allocate the foreign supply among the suppliers and importers in each area or country to be served. The committee is likewise empowered to prepare "adequate and detailed supply and import-allocation schedules covering the importation of petroleum into the United States and shall submit such schedules to the Director."

This committee can adjust among suppliers or importers differences between estimates and actual supplies of petroleum allocated and shipped. It can arrange with the War Shipping Administration for vessel tonnage to carry out its schedules of the movement of petroleum. The committee is directed to coordinate its activities with the British Overseas Supply Committee and such other committees or agencies as may be established by the Government of the United States or any of its Allies or friendly nations.

In short, this committee is empowered to determine how much oil each country will get and through exactly what companies it will receive it. It is also empowered to determine just how much oil this country is to import and through what companies we can import it.

Any person who is affected by any of the action of this committee or who thinks that he will be injured by comply-

ing with any of its schedules or plans can appeal to the Director of the Foreign Operations Committee of the Petroleum Administration for War and from that Director can appeal to the Petroleum Administrator for War. But that is as far as he can go, the decision of the Petroleum Administrator being absolutely final.

It is provided in this directive that plans or schedules developed by this committee shall become effective upon approval by the chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War and upon being issued either by the Petroleum Administrator or the Deputy Petroleum Administrator.

Now, it is obvious that the most sweeping powers have been granted to this committee. Their plans and schedules will be approved either by Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator, or by his Deputy Administrator, who happens to be Mr. Davies, the vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

As a practical matter, of course, the Petroleum Administrator, Mr. Ickes, the only bona fide governmental official in this whole picture that I can discover, is also Secretary of the Interior and has many other extremely important duties which, by the way, he has discharged with efficiency and faithfulness through the years. In the very nature of the case, however, it is obvious that what will practically happen is that the plans and schedules of the Foreign Operations Committee will be approved by his deputy, Mr. Davies, of the Standard Oil Co. of California, in most instances.

The chief counsel of the Petroleum Administration for War, who also has to give approval of such plans and schedules, is Mr. Howard Marshall. Mr. Marshall, like Mr. Davies, has been for years an official of the Standard Oil Co. of California.

It will be interesting to note here the names of the men who compose this Foreign Operations Committee, and I submit them herewith:

Orville Harden, Standard Oil of New Jersey, chairman.

J. A. Brown, of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.

Robert H. Colley, Atlantic Refining Co.

H. M. Herron, California-Texas Oil Co.

H. D. Collier, Standard Oil of California.

J. F. Drake, Gulf Oil Corporation.

Ralph W. Gallagher, Standard Oil of New Jersey.

W. F. Humphrey, Tidewater Associated Oil Co.

W. Alton Jones, Cities Service Co.

P. W. Parker, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.

W. S. S. Rodgers, Texas Corporation.

H. F. Sinclair, Consolidated Oil Corporation.

W. L. Stewart, Jr., Union Oil Co. of California.

I am not questioning at all the patriotism or good faith of these gentlemen, but it is perfectly obvious that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate this committee.

It will be seen that the major oil companies completely and wholly dominate

this committee. With one possible exception there is not a man on it who can by any stretch of the imagination be considered to represent any other interest than the major oil companies.

Another paragraph from the directive reads as follows:

The Foreign Operations Committee and its committees shall maintain such staff and appoint such persons as may be necessary or requisite to discharge the responsibilities, duties, and functions under this directive. Operation expenses of all such committees shall be made from a fund to which voluntary contribution may be made by persons engaged in the petroleum industry and such funds may be solicited by the Foreign Operations Committee.

In other words, Congress is effectively bypassed in this whole proposition. There will be no necessity of coming to Congress for any money to support the operations of this committee and hence no opportunity for review of its work whatsoever here on Capitol Hill. This committee can control the movement of oil all over the world, make arrangements and agreements with companies in other countries, and even apparently with their governments. It can control all shipments into the United States. And there is no way provided at all whereby public knowledge can be had of what it does or why it does it.

Most important of all, it seems to me, provision has been made in this directive for the invoking of section 12 of Public Law 603 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, whereby with the approval of the head of the War Production Board all antitrust laws can be set aside with regard to any action taken by this committee. Here we have the greatest charter of power, in my opinion, ever given to a group of essentially private citizens, directly connected with the most powerful natural-resource monopoly the world has ever known, over the most vital single resource that there is.

I might be somewhat less concerned about Petroleum Directive No. 70 were it not for what has happened heretofore in connection with petroleum directives and their operation. Under Directive No. 59 it was provided that, as to District No. 1, comprising the bulk of the Atlantic seaboard, all importations of petroleum products should be made by "primary suppliers," meaning the major oil companies, in exact proportion to their importations in 1941. This was supposed merely to maintain the same ratio of business between the various oil companies as existed in the past, which is, of course, an understandable thing. However, there is a substantial body of testimony from independent oil companies to the effect that the way this directive has actually worked out has been to prevent them from getting any petroleum products at all.

The question I want to ask with all of the earnestness at my command is this: Are we not witnessing here without any substantial protest on our part the complete cartelization of the oil industry of America under governmental sanction? And does not Directive No. 70 lay a perfect groundwork for the extension of this

process into the international field so that there is being developed a perfect framework for an international oil cartel more powerful than anything we have ever known before?

Mr. Speaker, I have not the slightest intention of putting preservation of the antitrust laws ahead of any consideration which is necessary to the winning of the war, but I cannot help wondering, especially in view of other events that have taken place in recent years in this particular industry, whether it is really necessary to suspend the antitrust laws in this instance or whether it is only a change fondly to be desired by the major oil companies. Neither do I question the patriotism or integrity of the men composing this committee or the officials of the Office of the Petroleum Administration for War. But I do know that habits of thought developed through long years of business experience are hard to change. I know that the whole philosophy of those who have fought to control production and price of things vital to our economy, is to reduce competition to a minimum if not to eliminate it completely.

In war, coordination of our economic efforts is, of course, essential, but what safeguards are included in this directive or anywhere else against the perpetuity of the inevitable monopolistic control which it has created into the post-war period? What chance will there be that the American Government itself can cope with the colossus of industrial power that will be here represented, and more especially what chance will there be for the protection of the public interest by means of any effective competition from truly independent concerns whatsoever?

Already a corporation named "War Emergency Tankers Incorporated" has been formed which controls the operation of all of the oil tankers available to our country so far as I know. All the stock of this corporation is held by the major oil companies. They are operating these tankers already, but have made, I am informed, verbal agreement with the Government that they will not profiteer as a result of this monopolistic control over the entire fleet of tankers.

As to the operation of these tankers by the major oil companies under this interesting arrangement, there is provision also for suspension of the antitrust laws. And Mr. Wilson, as acting head of the War Production Board, is officially recorded in the Federal Register as having agreed to suspension of the antitrust laws in order to allow the operation of War Emergency Tankers, Inc., to proceed unimpeded by any such consideration. And it is important to observe, I think, that as a practical matter, the War Production Board officials are far too busy to call in question requests on the part of the Petroleum Administration for suspension of the antitrust laws. Nor contrary to a widely held opinion in Congress, is the approval of the Department of Justice required. All that is required under the language of Public Law 603 is that the Attorney General shall have seen the order for suspension of the anti-

trust laws before it is issued. He does not, however, have to approve it in order for it to go into effect.

Perhaps some such committee as this was necessary, Mr. Speaker. I do not know. But off hand it would seem to me that the War Shipping Administration has ample power to direct the movement of all types of ships throughout the world and to make them available wherever needed.

Even granting, Mr. Speaker, that this extreme concentration of control over the oil industry of the world is necessary as a war measure, we are certainly justified in bringing up the question as to what agencies and persons shall be entrusted with bringing it about. Why, for example, are not the independent oil companies given some real representation on these boards and commissions? Why, in the second place, is there not at least one representative of the public without any other arduous duties on his shoulders placed on every one of these committees in order that the people may at least be informed of what is going on? Why indeed is not Congress asked to pass legislation specifically defining the powers of these groups of major oil company representatives who are being clothed so rapidly with supergovernmental powers? And finally, why, if Congress is not asked to do this, does it not on its own motion insist upon doing it?

In any case it is my firm conviction that the Congress should inquire very profoundly and I would add continuously into the activities not only of the Foreign Operations Committee, but of this entire interlocking directorate of major oil-company executives who now hold in their hands the key to the industrial and military future of our country—namely, petroleum.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. The Pan-American and California Standard Oil Co., I understand, has a concession from Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia, that comprises 250,000 square miles in that country. Has the gentleman made any exploration and inquiry as to what the conditions were that our Government, our State Department, or any officials of our Government, gave in Saudi Arabia, for those concessions, with reference particularly to Palestine? I understand that Ibn Saud has denied the purposes of the Balfour Declaration and resolutions adopted by this Congress. He has sought to have the British Colonial Office violate solemn treaties entered into with this Government with reference to immigration into Palestine. Has the gentleman any knowledge as to whether or not there is any connection between these cartels of which he speaks with reference to oil in the Levant and what these Arabs are trying to do with reference to the destiny of Palestine?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. I may say to the gentleman that I know something about that huge amount of oil that is in Arabia, but I did not speak about it today for the reason that I do

not feel that I know enough about it, and I did not feel prepared at this time to do it. I would rather not comment on it for that reason.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Northwest Farm News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with sugar, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an article on farm friends and friends of the farmer by A. G. Pace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON COTTON

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are two special orders outstanding for later today. If these gentlemen will yield to me, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of either of the gentlemen who have special orders following the one just finished, the gentleman may proceed for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just left my bewildered constituents—I have just hurried here from a State faced with a needless agricultural catastrophe.

When I left here a few weeks ago to return home to start my campaign for the Governorship of Louisiana this body was hard at work expediting the successful prosecution of war, and the people of Louisiana were backing up our armed efforts to the limit of their wealth and productive ability. Our farmers working short-handed and with patched-up equipment were bringing in cotton and other crops and responding to the Nation's demands for their fullest possible production. There is this year little money in the farm homes of America that is not divided between War bond commitments and the bare necessities for life and farming. The farm income is something that we now are studying, and the necessity of raising it we view with such importance that the granting of subsidies is under serious considera-

tion. And yet in the face of this fact, in the midst of the most perilous times, like a bolt from the sky without warning, comes an act against the farmers of the South.

A little handful of men in New York City, who probably never saw a bale of cotton or a single one of the millions of acres of cotton land of the South, have decided to put a ceiling on the price the farmer can get for his cotton. A fixed price on a farm commodity that has no fixed cost. This by and from a special clique of men who own no cotton and grow not one bale of cotton and probably would not be able to tell the difference between a bale of cotton and a bale of hay. Yet these are the men who have decided and so decreed that whatever the tides and fortunes of war, if loss is to be incurred in the commodity market it will be by the farmers and not by a special group of gamblers and speculators of the New York Cotton Exchange.

A Congress in this very Chamber enacted into law measures designed to protect the people of this Nation against such acts as has been committed by the willful, vicious, self-centered small group of large interests that control the New York Cotton Exchange. What happened seems to be quite clear. These men obviously misjudged the market and rather than take the losses of their gambling choose to welch on their contract to the detriment and loss of thousands of hard-working cotton farmers of the South. As the eminent Tom Linder, of Georgia, says, "The Government is holding the farmer while the gamblers skin him."

Already, Mr. Speaker, the far-reaching implications of this act have brought a storm of protest. In fact so adverse has been the criticism that the president of the New York Cotton Exchange has found it necessary to issue a series of bulletins and letters attempting to support and justify their position. It is hard to believe that the all-highest board of managers of the New York Cotton Exchange have heard the anguished cries of thousands of farmers, but something has provoked a hurried alibi and a makeshift defense for their nefarious act and they have begun to cry, "The war did it, not us."

In a confidential letter to his members dated October 23, Mr. Eric Alliot outlines the position whereby 15 men have taken a stand against the thousands of cotton farmers of the South. A stand that was devised behind closed doors, planned in secrecy, and delivered as one of the most effective blows against the morale of a sizable portion of the people of this Nation yet delivered in this war. Cotton ceiling day, October 13, may well be another Pearl Harbor for the farmers of the South if swift action is not taken against these 15 men.

There is much of interest in this letter from Mr. Eric Alliot, leader of the 15 men, that will warrant close scrutiny. For instance, they elected to welch on the October contracts and cited contracts of September 13 as "a day of congestion," and many will ask "what was the matter with that particular day, were not those contracts just as good as the

ones made on the previous trading day, September 11, or the day after, September 14? Or is the better question whose contracts caused the congestion—who bought and who sold these contracts and who is protecting who?"

In this same letter Mr. Alliot says that it was done to prevent price distortion—what he must mean by price distortion is no price movement that would be favorable to the farmers and cost his gambling friends money. Again Mr. Alliot says the act followed "careful consideration of all the facts," and, I might add, a quick look at their own bank balances. Again Mr. Alliot said, "the action was taken with due regard for the rights of all concerned." I question this and defy him to name a single farmer or merchant whom he consulted.

Reduced to terms of money, the ceiling price arbitrarily placed 75 cents a bale below the prevailing market price meant a loss of 75 cents a bale for the farmers and an immediate profit of 75 cents a bale for the gamblers—a profit for the gamblers on something they did not own against the farmer's loss on something he did own.

Ultimately this action—the placing of a ceiling on cotton—rolling onward like a wave of economic destruction, broke the market an additional \$2 a bale—making the total loss by this action \$2.75 per bale, a total of \$55,000,000 loss in the value of the visible supply of cotton. For those of you not from the South, let me tell you that the visible supply of cotton in the country is approximately 20,000,000 bales. Therefore this original "ceiling day" 75 cents a bale taken away from the farmer meant a loss to the working people of the South of approximately \$15,000,000. Add this to the depreciation of the market caused by this demoralizing action and you have the simple fact that 15 men have reduced the value of the Nation's cotton by \$55,000,000, not one cent of which they could or can spare.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, Who are these 15 men who take into their own hands the Bill of Rights and dare to destroy the property value of the most important commodity produced in this country? This, Mr. Speaker, is an action far beyond any that Congress has seen fit to take. Who is this ring leader, this willful gambler, this captain of the band of 15 men who have visited such catastrophe upon our people? Is it possible to get him before a committee of our members for explanations of his acts? The results are so clear and so visibly a violation of the best interests of the Nation that he already stands condemned and found guilty. Or is this leader an untouchable—and is the remedy the simple clean out and the removal of the gambling casino in New York known as the New York Cotton Exchange?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial, and in the other to include a poem on the question of saving human lives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a communication I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FARM PRICES

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is with no desire of criticizing any individual that I rise to point out the erroneous implications that are contained in the letter of October 19, addressed by Hon. Prentiss Brown, the recently resigned Director of the Office of Price Administration, to the President, which letter was inserted on page 8776 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my able and outstanding colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. My concern in this regard grows out of the fact that the statements I refer to are all calculated to encourage the widespread misconception that farmers as a class are enjoying a disproportionately large share of the increased national income, and that unconscionably high farm prices are contributing materially to an unduly high level of food prices.

Mr. Speaker, too many people in more or less responsible positions have encouraged this misleading belief. I cannot, therefore, sit idly by and allow the figures in Mr. Brown's letter to go unchallenged. No matter how innocent he may be of any conscious effort to mislead, his statement does in fact mislead, and does create an unfair and unjust resentment against farmers in the minds of those who read it and accept it as true. I realize full well that my remarks will not receive the widespread publicity accorded those of Mr. Brown. I realize that it is perfectly natural for those who read Mr. Brown's statement and my statement, to say to themselves and, indeed, to their associates, "Mr. Brown was in a better position to know the facts than that country Congressman from Texas." I have, therefore, brought with me and today hold in my hand the very publication from which Mr. Brown quoted that at least those of my colleagues who are here can see for themselves that I am correctly stating the facts.

Mr. Brown took proper credit for checking the upward trend in the cost of living, but he erroneously tried to show that the selfishness of farmers was the greatest obstacle to his efforts. Specifically his letter says:

The upward trend in the cost of living has been definitely arrested.

He then cites figures for different dates. Then he continues—I again quote:

It is interesting to note the comparison of the wholesale prices of 1 year ago and those of today as contained in the New York Times commodity price index. The October 17 issue

shows that the increases are mainly in those items such as wheat, corn, oats, and barley, where either we did not have authority to act by reason of the parity limitations or the commodity had only recently reached parity. A few outstanding examples of the solidity of price control are as follows.

Here follows a tabulation of various commodities such as iron, steel, copper, cotton print cloth, gas, and crude oil, all of which are shown to be selling at the same price on October 16, 1943, as on October 17, 1942. The only items listed in this tabulation which were included in the above paragraph from which I have quoted are wheat and corn, both of which are shown, in keeping with the idea that the farmer is causing inflation, to have advanced in price very materially. Mr. Brown's letter lists the price of wheat as of October 16, 1943, at \$1.93½ per bushel and of corn on the same date at \$1.21½ per bushel.

Now, I have no objection to Mr. Brown stating that the price of wheat has advanced. It has. It was woefully low—far below parity a year ago. But I do object most strenuously when Mr. Brown or Mr. White or Mr. Black leads the people of the United States to believe that any farmer in the United States can get \$1.90 for his wheat. The prices he quoted are alleged to be the New York City prices. Unfortunately for both farmers and producers, the yield of wheat on Times Square has been notoriously low for many years. No farmer gets any such price as Mr. Brown has mentioned, and that there may be no charge that I am not willing to back my words with my acts, I have a little wheat in Texas. I here and now offer it to Mr. Brown or anyone else who has tried to place the odium of excessive food prices on the farmer at \$1.64½ per bushel. That is considerably more than I can get for it, but it is 30 cents per bushel less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Now, do not all of you run up here with your certified checks to take my wheat.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas. I hope he wants to take my wheat at 30 cents less than Mr. Brown says it is worth.

Mr. HOPE. I call the attention of the gentleman also to the fact that at the time those farmers sold their wheat in his country and in mine the price was at least 25 cents a bushel less than it is today.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. We sold wheat for just about a dollar in my country. We harvested a little before you did.

The truth is that wheat is generally quoted at one of the terminal markets and all of these terminal markets are higher than the price the farmer gets, but let us see just what the very issue of the New York Times, which Mr. Brown quotes, says. I have the business and financial section of that issue of the New York Times in my hand. On page 12 of section 5 of the issue of October 17, 1943, we find an article headed "Commodity index study." The article bears a Washington date line of October 16. It

quotes from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It says:

The following table shows specific commodities by actual selling price.

It lists Kansas City wheat at \$1.51½ and Minneapolis wheat at \$1.46½—a little discrepancy of between .40 and .50 as compared with Mr. Brown's figures. The same article gives the price of corn at \$1.06, not \$1.21 as listed in Mr. Brown's article. And these figures are admittedly terminal market prices, not farm prices. I submit that the use of such misleading figures could only be intended to give an unfair picture of farm income.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and I am glad that he is giving this valuable information to the House. I just want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Brown's O. P. A. organization has placed a ceiling of \$1.07 on corn at Chicago which means from 90 to 95 cents on the farm. Apparently he does not have much confidence in the ability of his own ceilings to hold.

Mr. POAGE. Apparently his ceilings have been working better in the farmers' areas than they have in the consumers' areas, because we have been getting only below the ceiling price.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the gentleman does not want to do Mr. Brown an injustice. I had understood that this was perhaps a typographical error in Mr. Brown's statement. I wonder if the gentleman has called Mr. Brown's office to see if that is not the case.

Mr. POAGE. No; because regardless of whether or not it is a typographical error—and I do not know that it is an error—I certainly would not suggest that these may not be the prices that Mr. Brown found in some bank in New York. I do not mean to suggest that Mr. Brown has made any misstatement, but he has misled the public. Doubtless these are the prices on Times Square. I do not know what wheat is selling for on Times Square. I do not know what corn is bringing on the Battery. Doubtless these are the prices in New York City. I am not going to discuss that. I am not questioning the truthfulness of Mr. Brown's statement, but I am pointing out that the figures are not the prices that farmers receive. I am pointing out the fact that they are far away from the actual prices the producer gets.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I state that within the last few days I sold some corn from my farm in Minnesota for 91 cents, which is the ceiling in my community.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Brown said it was worth \$1.21 plus. Even the figures I have quoted from the New York Times of the

date Mr. Brown quotes are admittedly the terminal market prices and not the prices on the farm. They obviously are higher than any farmer is receiving. So I submit again that, admitting that Mr. Brown's figures are correct for New York City, they are misleading as giving an untrue picture of what the farmers of this country are receiving.

Now, the vitally important thing is that these or similarly inaccurate figures have undoubtedly been taken as a basis of further calculations whereby Mr. Brown and others connected with the O. P. A. have undertaken to convince the public that the farmer is to blame for most of the increase in the cost of living. In the very next column of his letter Mr. Brown quotes some figures to show that food and raw materials have advanced in price much faster than have manufactured articles. Of course, if you are willing to assume that the farmer can get \$1.90 for \$1.40 wheat, then you can undoubtedly prove that he has received an undue share of national income; but the facts are, as so ably demonstrated by my good friend the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. STEVE PACE, that if we use a fair yardstick, the total income of 29,084,000 farm people last year was but \$15,600,000,000 out of a total national income of \$117,000,000,000. In fact, there is no other large group of our society which receives so small a per capita income even today.

Nor has the price of things farmers sell gone up with anything like the rapidity with which industrial wages have advanced. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the average of all farm prices is today 1.93 percent of the average of these prices during the base period of 1909-14. This is, however, based on all products, not simply 58 selected items which Mr. Brown uses to show that farm prices have advanced more rapidly in this war than in the First World War. As a matter of fact, there can be little doubt that the inclusive calculations of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics are actually unfair to farmers in that they give too much weight to certain relatively unimportant crops as compared with the prices of the three great basic crops which make up more than two-thirds of the value of all field crops of the Nation—corn, cotton, and wheat. As a matter of fact, the price of cotton is only 171 percent and the price of grain is only 158 percent of price during the base period. But how much worse—how deliberately unfair—it is when a high official of the O. P. A. picks out 58 unknown crops and uses them as a yardstick to prove that the farmer is getting too much.

Let us get this thing out in the open. Let us call our shots and name our crops. Let us take the big three—the three crops that make up the bulk of the farm income of America. During the base period 1909-14 the average price of corn, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, was 64.2 cents per bushel. Last month, according to the same source, it was \$1.09 per bushel. The price of cotton was 12.4 cents per pound during the base period. Now the price of cotton is 20.2 cents per pound. The

price of wheat was 88.01 cents per bushel during the base period. Now the price of wheat is \$1.30 per bushel. During the same period the average hourly earnings in all manufacturing industries advanced, according to the same source, from 21.16 cents per hour in the base period to 85.3 cents per hour last year. Of course, the actual increase in earnings is considerably larger, as these figures use only the basic hourly wage and take no account of overtime. On the other hand, all the farmer's overtime is included in his price.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. PACE. It so happens that yesterday I checked the average wage of all of the manufacturing establishments of the United States and find that the average now is 96.4 cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. And that is an increase of 7 cents over what it was a month ago.

Mr. PACE. Ninety-six and four-tenths cents per hour.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

The truth is that everybody's income has been going up faster than the farmer's and the result has been that today the laboring man working in our American factories is actually spending a smaller percent of his weekly income for food than ever before in the history of the country. Let us consider the bituminous coal miners. We have been told that they were in about as bad shape as any group of workers. During the base period they earned 31.26 cents per hour. Last year they earned \$1.059 per hour plus overtime. But the miner is interested in the amount of food he can buy with his labor and this is, we must all agree, the final test of the justice of any wage scale or farm price level. What are the facts? From what the miners' union has said, and from what the O. P. A. has intimated, one would naturally suppose that the miner was today working many more hours to earn enough to buy the same scanty diet for himself and family that he earned with fewer hours' work in the past. Such is not the fact. The O. P. A. has singled out butter as a product that has reached such a price level that it has become necessary for the Government to pay a subsidy rather than to let it rise any further. The truth is that just before the subsidy was placed on butter, the bituminous coal miner could buy 3 pounds of butter for 1 hour's work while in the base period he could only buy 1.2 pounds of butter with the proceeds of 1 hour's work. So it is all down the line. Those engaged in industrial work are almost without exception able to buy more of the products of the farm in exchange for fewer hours of labor than ever before.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is in favor of increasing the price of crude oil in order to have more oil produced. I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that regard, and I believe also that the Speaker of the House agrees with him.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with that part of Mr. PATMAN's philosophy, but not with that false part of his position which would deny to the farmer a fair price for his products, and try to make it up out of subsidies from the Public Treasury.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct. I am also in disagreement with the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in that particular. I rose simply to say that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] would apply the same formula to the farmer that he wants to apply to the oil producer, we could have sufficient oil and proper prices for the farmer's products.

Mr. POAGE. Unquestionably, and I would apply the same formula to the oil producer and the farmer, and that is the formula that we have applied to those engaged in war work and those who have received war contracts, but we have not been able to get any such thing for the farmer or the oil producer. That would simply apply the American doctrine of fair play and equal treatment all along the line.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want the laborer's toil to buy less than the farmer's, but neither do I think it just to ask the farmer to continue to toil to earn an unduly small share of the national income. It seems to me to be clear. The thing we should determine is: Does the farmer demand of the industrial worker and the city dweller, and does the farmer require that the laborer and the city dweller pay the wage earned from an unreasonably large number of units of labor in exchange for the farm products he buys. And in this determination, we should not assume, as does Mr. Brown, that the farmer gets \$1.94 for wheat. Let it be remembered that the farmer only gets the farm price—not the delivered price. Let it be remembered that in many cases, if not in most cases, the labor, transportation, and processing costs of the farm products that the consumer buys greatly exceed the prices the farmer receives. The shirt I am wearing cost \$2.50. It does not have 12½ cents' worth of cotton in it and yet most consumers attribute the increase in the cost of clothes to the alleged avarice of the cotton farmer and the sheep grower. Even the loaf of bread that you buy has less than 2 cents' worth of wheat figured at Mr. Brown's figures.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is not responsible for the increase in the cost of living. He has received a relatively small increase in his prices when compared with the very groups that still come before our people and arrogantly threaten to strike and do strike when their wages are not increased. The farmer's costs of production have advanced very rapidly. He must have higher prices, or he cannot produce. Note, Mr. Speaker, I did not say "will not" produce. I said "cannot." There is a vast difference. Farming is an operation that requires equipment. That equipment is not going to be forthcoming from the factories unless the farmer can pay. He has nothing with which to pay except with the sale price of his farm products.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert three tables prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and by the Bureau of Labor Sta-

tistics very shortly before the so-called roll-back subsidies broke the market for some of the farmers' most important products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Estimated amount of respective farm products that could be purchased with average earnings from 1 hour's labor in selected industries, 1909-13 average and 1942

Industry	Cotton, pounds		Wheat, pounds		Corn, pounds		Dry edible beans, pounds		Potatoes, pounds		Peanuts, pounds		Rice, pounds	
	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942
All manufacturing.....	1.7	4.5	14.4	47.9	18.4	53.0	6.3	16.4	18.2	44.2	4.4	14.3	11.7	23.8
Cotton manufacturing.....	1.2	2.9	9.8	30.3	12.5	33.5	4.3	10.4	12.4	28.0	3.0	9.0	7.9	15.1
Iron and steel.....	2.3	5.0	19.4	52.8	24.9	58.3	8.5	18.0	24.6	48.7	6.0	15.7	15.8	26.2
Woolen.....	1.4	3.9	11.6	41.9	14.9	46.3	5.1	14.3	14.8	38.7	3.6	12.5	9.5	20.8
Bituminous coal.....	2.5	5.6	21.3	59.5	27.2	65.8	9.3	20.3	26.9	54.9	6.5	17.7	17.3	29.6
Clothing.....	1.8	3.5	15.5	37.0	19.8	40.9	6.8	12.6	19.6	34.1	4.7	11.0	12.6	18.4
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	1.6	4.3	13.1	45.3	16.8	50.1	5.7	15.5	16.6	41.8	4.0	13.5	10.7	22.5
Boots and shoes.....	1.9	3.5	15.6	36.9	20.0	40.7	6.8	12.6	19.8	34.0	4.8	11.0	12.7	18.3
Lumber (sawmills).....	1.6	3.4	13.1	35.7	16.7	39.4	5.7	12.2	16.6	32.9	4.0	10.6	10.6	17.7
Hosiery and knit goods.....	1.3	3.1	10.7	33.1	13.6	36.6	4.6	11.3	13.5	30.6	3.3	9.9	8.7	16.5

Industry	Tobacco, pounds		Hogs, pounds		Beef cattle, pounds		Butter, pounds		Milk, pounds		Eggs, dozens		Chickens, pounds	
	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942	1909-14	1942
All manufacturing.....	2.1	2.4	2.9	6.5	3.9	8.0	0.8	2.4	13.2	33.2	1.0	2.9	1.9	4.5
Cotton manufacturing.....	1.4	1.5	2.0	4.1	2.6	5.1	.6	1.5	9.0	21.0	.7	1.8	1.3	2.9
Iron and steel.....	2.9	2.6	3.9	7.2	5.3	8.8	1.1	2.7	17.9	36.5	1.3	3.1	2.5	5.0
Woolens.....	1.7	2.1	2.4	5.7	3.2	7.0	.7	2.1	10.7	29.0	.8	2.5	1.5	3.9
Bituminous coal.....	3.1	2.9	4.3	8.1	5.8	10.0	1.2	3.0	19.5	41.2	1.5	3.5	2.7	5.6
Clothing.....	2.3	1.8	3.1	5.1	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.2	25.6	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Slaughtering and meat packing.....	1.9	2.2	2.7	6.2	3.6	7.6	.8	2.3	12.0	31.4	.9	2.7	1.7	4.3
Boots and shoes.....	2.3	1.8	3.2	5.0	4.2	6.2	.9	1.9	14.4	25.5	1.1	2.2	2.0	3.5
Lumber (sawmills).....	1.9	1.8	2.6	4.9	3.5	6.0	.8	1.8	12.0	24.7	.9	2.1	1.7	3.4
Hosiery and knit goods.....	1.6	1.6	2.2	4.5	2.9	5.6	.6	1.7	9.8	23.0	.7	2.0	1.4	3.1

Source: The computations are based on (1) prices received by farmers as published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture; (2) hourly earnings as reported in Real Wages in the United States, 1890-1926, by Paul Douglas, for the 1909-14 average (with some series adjusted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics level); and (3) 1942 hourly earnings as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Farm prices are those received by farmers for the period August 1909 to July 1914 and the season average for 1942. The 5-year average for hourly earnings is the calendar years 1910-14.

Quantities of farm products required to purchase specified commodities, United States, 1910-14 and 1942

Commodity	Unit	1910-14	1942
Grain binder, 7-foot.....	Bushel of wheat...	156.1	280.9
Corn planter, 2-row.....	Bushel of corn.....	66.0	118.4
Cream separator.....	Pound of butterfat.....	263.1	239.0
Overalls.....	Pound of cotton.....	7.1	9.5
Cultivator, 1-horse.....	do.....	38.5	49.7
Shoes, work.....	Pound of beef cattle.....	40.2	31.0
Hoe, 7-inch blade.....	Pound of cotton.....	3.9	5.2

¹ 250-quart capacity, 1910-14; 500-pound capacity, 1942.

² Shoes brogans, 1910-14; shoes, work, 1942.

³ Hoes, each, 1910-14; hoes, 7-inch blade, 1942.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously presented these figures to the Congress. As I pointed out at that time, I did not make these tables. I am not responsible for the conditions that created these figures; neither are the farmers of this country. We did not even collect the figures. We do not claim to be economists, but I know, and the farmers of this country know, and I believe that every fair-minded man and woman knows that these actual figures refute the implied slurs on the patriotism of our farmers. They do more than that, Mr. Speaker. They show very clearly that if America is going to continue to eat as we want to eat that some of the Government agencies are going to have to try to find some way of letting the farmer get a fair price, a price that will enable him to continue to produce, rather than to try to find ways and means whereby other groups can get their food for an ever decreasing percentage of their income. I am not asking for \$3 wheat or 40-cent cotton, although we had these

prices during the last war. I am asking simply that the farmer be given a fair share of whatever the national income may be. Unless that is done, it is no answer to say that the farmers' prices have increased.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order of the House, heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] for 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

DISUNITY THRIVES IN TEXAS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to express my appreciation of the splendid address we have listened to from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. He has presented a very lucid statement about the farmer's problem. It is in sharp contrast with the rather curious and circuitous line of reasoning that the gentleman's colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been giving us from the standpoint of farm subsidies, and I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] on his factual statement and his courageous analysis of the agricultural situation.

The farmers of this country must not have fastened on them the stigma of asking the returned soldiers from this war to assume the costs of living in this country at a time when our national in-

come is at an all-time high. This fantastic scheme comes not from the farmers, but from a small coterie of politicians who are more interested in farm votes than they are in farm income.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes along the same line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel, as the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has just stated, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] should be complimented on the facts he has brought out here today. I would like to add this one thing to the subject in connection with corn: In October 1936 we were receiving \$1.02 for corn in southwestern Minnesota, whereas today we receive 91 and 92 cents per bushel. If the farmer can be accused of receiving too much today under present conditions, when he pays twice as much for labor as he paid in 1936 and when everything else is out of proportion accordingly, there is something entirely wrong with the figures of those who decide what farm commodities are now worth. In order to produce the necessary food, the farmer must be given the prices for his products which will enable him to feed our Nation; otherwise he cannot do his best.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in what my colleagues have just said concerning the very splendid discussion of agricultural prices which our distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] has just given the House.

I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the O. P. A. price ceiling on beef cattle went into effect yesterday. On Tuesday the Committee on Agriculture of the House was assured by officials from the O. P. A. that the ceiling would work, and they stated they felt sure that it would not in any way disturb the normal flow of cattle to market. I just want to say at this time that reliable reports which I have from the market centers of the country indicate that there was confusion and disorder in every great cattle market in the country yesterday, and that as a result of this confusion there were 3,500 fat cattle which were carried over on the market at Kansas City yesterday. It is almost an unprecedented situation to have 3,500 fat cattle carried over on the Kansas City market on Wednesday. Reports from other markets are similar.

The only reason for the failure of the markets to function is the confusing and incomprehensible order which has been issued by O. P. A.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is it not also true that the four gentlemen who testified before the committee did not even inform us that they were going to put this in, and is it not also a fact that none of them has had any experience on the farm, and is it not a fact that three of the four are Harvard graduates, according to their own statements?

Mr. HOPE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. That is my recollection of the statements made by those gentlemen before the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks by including a statement made by Mr. R. M. Evans, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, of course, everybody knows that in all that is good Iowa affords the best. There is a little village in about the center of the northwest quarter of Iowa named Laurens. Like Goldsmith's village it is the fairest village of the plain. It is also my home town. We produced there a young man named R. M. Evans, who is now one of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board. He recently gave a statement to one of the Iowa papers, in which he discussed plans for international

currency stabilization, which I think is informative, concise, and valuable. Most of these money experts talk in such scientific and cabalistic language that ordinary folks cannot understand them. I place this in the record, as it is a very concise and clear statement of what is proposed by way of international currency stabilization.

It is as follows:

PLANS FOR INTERNATIONAL CURRENCY STABILIZATION

A great deal of study has been given to a program for creating an international currency stabilization fund in the post-war period. A currency stabilization fund would be important and useful but we should not lose sight of the fact that the mechanism of such a fund cannot, by itself, bring universal prosperity.

When all is said and done, it is simply a machine for doing a job, and unless the conditions in the respective countries are carefully watched and are favorable to agriculture, industry, and commerce the machinery of a fund would not work at all and the fund by itself could not change these conditions.

True, recommendations might be made to countries but the countries themselves have their own legislative and administrative machinery for making these changes and they are not going to act in accordance with the desires of other countries unless they are certain such a course would be in their own best interests.

EFFECT UPON THE TARIFF

Several of these programs were discussed at a recent meeting and one of those present asked whether or not the stabilization fund would operate to deprive industry of tariff protection. Such a question indicates that some people are expecting this machinery to undertake things that are far beyond its scope.

The answer, of course, to this question is that the proposal has nothing whatsoever to do with raising or lowering tariffs. Tariffs are adjusted by Congress or by trade agreements in this country.

With a view to presenting a simplified picture of the main functions performed by a fund of this kind, I am setting forth a few of the main features of such a fund and leaving the details to those who are expert in this particular field.

FROM WAR TO PEACE

When the war ends Great Britain, Germany, Russia, and other countries will try to reconvert their wartime industries to the commerce of peace as rapidly as possible.

They will need foodstuffs and industrial raw materials (cotton, oil, metals, etc.) as well as machinery and other things for which they will not be able to pay by exporting their own goods and services because their factories will not be equipped for peacetime production.

Many of them will be short of gold with which to make payment and they may not find it feasible to arrange private credits in financial centers.

Some of the most acute situations will have to be met by direct relief measures, and a United Nations organization is in the making to handle this big job.

LONG-TERM CREDITS

In other cases which are not so severe the problem will be to extend credit to bridge over the period until the countries concerned can pay their own way again by exporting to the rest of the world. It is to be hoped that such credits can be arranged mostly on a long-term basis, since it will take many of the devastated countries some time to develop production to the point where they can

start repayment by exporting more than they import.

Such long-term credits will have to be negotiated on a specific basis with countries like the United States, which will have a surplus of goods and services, although it may be possible to work out a plan whereby the various creditor countries can coordinate their lending activities through some international institution.

A CUSHION FUND

Finally, however, it would seem desirable to let foreign countries have a "cushion" of short-term credit with which they could operate during the transitional period. This is one of the initial purposes of the fund, and one which can be served only by having some sort of fund set up as soon as the war ends.

For example, if England wanted to buy cotton and there were no dollars available in the market because they had all been used in the purchase of other American products, she would give the fund English pounds sterling equal to the number of American dollars needed to pay for the cotton. The rate of exchange would be fixed within relatively narrow limits. The English manufacturers would weave the cotton into goods to be sold, let us say, to America for dollars and to Brazil for cruzeiros. The dollars could then be returned to the fund and the English would receive their pounds back.

COFFEE FROM BRAZIL

The United States might want to buy some coffee from Brazil so we would trade American dollars to England for Brazilian cruzeiros, which the English received from Brazil in payment for cotton goods sold by England to Brazil. We would then use the Brazilian cruzeiros to pay for the coffee. The rate of exchange in each case would be the rate set by the fund. The English would again receive their pounds back and the fund, as far as England is concerned, would be in relative balance.

It is important to understand that the fund would not in any way interfere with ordinary exchange transactions in the market. It would only handle such uncleared transactions as might develop after all dealings in the market will have been effected. It will enter into the picture at the point where gold used to enter in the gold standard days.

If the conditions in the world are favorable to agriculture, commerce, and industry, and if people are willing to trade with each other without being too nationalistic in their viewpoint, the fund will balance over a period of years and prove to be a simple and effective device for facilitating trade.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" FOR ALL

In this country we are vitally interested in seeing that people return to their peacetime pursuits as quickly as possible after hostilities cease.

World conditions will still be chaotic, and if mass unemployment, unrest, and starvation were long continued, conditions would again be ripe for a revolution—and revolutions bring dictators.

If democracy is to thrive as the future type of government, it will have to provide a steadily rising standard of living. The "four freedoms" will have to be visible to all.

A SAFETY MEASURE

When making loans from the fund to the war-torn countries in order to permit them to purchase raw materials and equipment, short-term credit should be given—and of course it would be necessary, not only for the safety of the fund itself but for the well-being of the borrower, to see that the volume of such loans is in keeping with the commerce of the country involved. Long-term loans for capital investments, such as building airways and factories and developing water

power, should be outside the field covered by the machinery of the fund.

The effect of such loans on the future ability of the country to pay or of our country to receive payments in goods and services would have to be carefully considered.

NOT AS IN THE TWENTIES

Maybe American investors will become more internationally minded as time goes on, but the point I want to emphasize is that we should not mix long-term financing with the short-time commercial operations of the fund.

It would be folly to repeat the error of the twenties and loan money that could not be repaid, and yet we must take a modest risk in order to achieve an over-all good.

You may well ask the question, "How will England sell enough goods and services to pay back the amount of money she takes from the fund at the beginning?"

We might just as well face the fact now that England, or any other country for that matter, cannot pay us unless the people in America are prepared to accept goods and services in return for the material and equipment we sell. This would hold equally true for all the other members of the fund.

There was a time prior to the First World War when it was unnecessary to give much thought to this particular question because the United States was in debt to the countries of the Old World, and day by day the interest and amortization payments fell due in American dollars and were accumulated by the British, French, and other peoples. These dollars were used to purchase our cotton, wheat, automobiles, and other products. However, conditions have changed. British and other foreign investments in this country have been largely liquidated. We are now out of debt to foreign countries and, instead, they are heavily indebted to us.

FOUR COURSES OF ACTION

Assuming we want to continue in the export business there are four courses of action to follow:

First, we could accept gold in payment for the difference between what we buy and what we sell. At the present time we have more gold than we need for commercial uses and backing for our currency. More gold would be quite useless unless we were prepared to use it in purchasing goods and services from the rest of the world.

W. P. A. PROJECT

Second, we could give away our surplus commodities and services to the rest of the world, considering such a move a W. P. A. project to create work and employment in this country.

But this would be philanthropy—not trade—and the question would naturally be raised, "Why wouldn't it be better to use the surplus material and labor to build houses or something that would increase the standard of living for the people in this country?"

Living standards can be improved in all countries, and they must be improved if trade is to flourish. Business people in America cannot trade in a worth-while way with bankrupt people in other lands.

The third course of action would be to make long-term loans. These loans would furnish countries with money to purchase materials they could not otherwise pay for. Long-term loans would simply postpone the day of settlement to some future time when we might be willing to accept payment in goods and services.

BUYING FROM ABROAD

Our fourth course of action, which is the one we must adopt if a mechanism of this kind is to become really useful, would be to purchase sufficient goods and services from abroad to pay for what we sell.

LXXXIX—560

Now, transactions of this kind are not quite as complicated as one might believe. Suppose England buys some cotton, wheat, pork, machinery, and automobiles from this country—it does not necessarily follow that we must purchase directly from England in order to secure payment. We might buy coffee from Brazil and rubber from the Orient, and the money Brazil and the Orient, for instance, owe to Great Britain for goods and services purchased could be used by Great Britain to pay for its purchases from us through the fund at relatively constant rates of exchange.

One of the genuine aids to business would be the relative stability of exchange rates. Future plans could be made with greater safety if these exchange rates were not subject to speculative changes from time to time.

IMPORTS NECESSARY

The main point to keep in mind is that if we are going to export in a businesslike way it will be necessary to import, and if we import as much as we export, a fund can furnish the machinery to make the operation efficient and economical.

But if we are unprepared to accept imports in a volume equivalent to our exports, we might just as well face reality and forget the fund because no fund of this kind could operate successfully over a period of time unless we follow the fourth course of action outlined above.

In order to accomplish this result, it is not necessary to import products that would create such competition as to ruin American industry. Trading in many articles and services (in such a way that American agriculture and industry would not be injured) with other countries would help to increase employment and raise our standard of living.

ON AN INDIVIDUAL BASIS

Foreign trade is very similar to business between individuals.

If you go downtown and buy a suit of clothes or some groceries from the corner store, you ordinarily use money to pay for them. You earned the money by selling your own goods or services to someone else. As long as you do that, you are all right and the economy is all right, but if you lose your job or your crops are a failure and you do not have money to pay for the things you want, someone will have to give the money to you or you will have to borrow.

If the money is given to you, that closes the transaction, but if you borrow to pay for these things you will have to sell your goods, crops, or services sometime in the future to pay off the loan—and so it is between nations.

The currency stabilization fund, by itself, is merely machinery for the smooth operation of international trade. True, it has certain supervisory functions. One function is to keep exchange rates from fluctuating too widely in order to prevent the retarding of commerce. You know how it is in your own business—when prices fluctuate wildly, you cannot operate efficiently or economically. Stabilization of exchanges within relatively narrow limits helps to promote trade.

WILL IT WORK?

The basic fact we must face at this time is not so much the particular kind of stabilization fund we are going to set up, but rather the all-important question of whether our Nation and the other nations of the world are going to create an atmosphere and condition in which agriculture, industry, and commerce can thrive.

If we do this, we will have peace and prosperity for generations to come. If not, we might just as well oil our guns and keep our ammunition dry.

If, after the war, the inhabitants of countries participating in the fund are enabled to have a good standard of living, then they will be in a frame of mind to retain a peaceful and democratic type of government.

If, on the other hand, agriculture, industry, and commerce are throttled and retarded by unwise national policies and the selfish interests of individuals and countries, these favorable conditions will not exist and an economic stabilization fund would be just one more piece of useless machinery that started out to achieve a very desirable result but could not accomplish that purpose because conditions were against it.

American agriculture and industry cannot maintain maximum production unless a reasonable percentage of their products are exported. Surpluses of farm products and surpluses of labor will hold down our national income.

POST-WAR TASKS

Just stop and think for a moment about the national income of the post-war period. We will have to service our debt.

We will have to maintain a large Army and Navy.

We will have to pay the expenses of expanded social services that have been created and have proved their worth.

All of this can be done and we can have a far better standard of living than we have ever enjoyed if we do sufficient business to keep our American economy operating in high gear.

You hear some people say, "Well, we will live within ourselves and if others want to buy our products, let them come and get them."

They might more accurately say, "Let us have unemployment and a low standard of living." But no one would publicly advocate the latter, though too often we unwittingly do things that have this bad result.

I have purposely omitted consideration of the necessary and important administrative details that will have to be worked out in order to put a stabilization fund into successful operation. I believe our Government should lay down certain general guides and leave to some capable agency the working out of the plan. Congress should demand a full and complete report each year so it can alter the course as it deems best in the interests of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Members of the House that they are invited to the ceremony which will take place at 1:15 this afternoon in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building where a number of women will be sworn in as WAC's. It will be a very impressive ceremony and I know the Members will be interested.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent

requests: One, that I may revise and extend my own remarks and include a letter from a group of dairymen from Menden, Okla., and in another extension of remarks to include a resolution from a group of dairymen in Holgate, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, November 1, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee at 11 a. m. on Friday, October 29, 1943, on H. R. 2522 and 2832.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 3142, to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2203, to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes (relative to State income taxes, determination of domicile, etc.), also at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 786, a bill to amend section 40 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (to include chiropractic practitioners) at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, November 10, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Tuesday, November 2, 1943, at 11 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 2452, entitled, "A bill granting a pension to Oliver M. Abbott," introduced by Representative BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3564. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the vicinity of Los Angeles, in the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3565. A bill to extend the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, for 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3566. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3567. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, to provide additional safeguards for the protection of explosives and ingredients thereof; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 336. Resolution authorizing an investigation with respect to certain action contemplated by the United States in connection with post-war relief and rehabilitation in foreign countries; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. R. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Francis T. Lillie and Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3310. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of August Meier and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3311. Also, petition of Philip Drzwiecke and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3312. Also, petition of Edw. C. Schmid and 24 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3313. Also, petition of William Metzger and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3314. Also, petition of the Sligo Iron Store Co. and signed by 23 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3315. Also, petition of Edward M. Lohse, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3316. Also, petition of Clare L. Garrity, of Washington, D. C., and 19 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3317. Also, petition of Arthur Davis, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, pro-

testing against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3318. Also, petition of Morris J. Taney, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3319. Also, petition of the Trocadero Cafe, of Washington, D. C., signed by 20 citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3320. Also, petition of David E. Barry, of Washington, D. C., and 20 other citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3321. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petitions of Andrew Easdale and 30 other citizens of Hunnewell, Mrs. R. L. McClain and 19 other citizens of Laredo, Mrs. H. R. Forner and 21 other citizens of Memphis, and Mrs. Russell Atkins and 19 other citizens of Livingston County, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3322. Also, petitions of D. J. Van Desander and 75 other citizens of Hannibal, Mrs. Lillie Green and 40 signers from La Belle, Mrs. Bertha Luker and 50 other citizens of Knox City, L. O. VanNostrand and 40 other citizens of Milan, all of the State of Missouri, urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3323. By Mr. SCRIVENER: Petition of sundry citizens of Iola, Allen County, Kans., urging passage of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3324. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of C. A. Schafer and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, October 25, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, whose light is truth, whose warmth is love, we thank Thee for the miracle of dawn which calls to holy dedication of renewed powers, for noon-tide with its summons to play the man in a solemn day that demands our best, and for the quiet of twilight, like bells at evening pealing, which brings whispers of that realm where beyond these voices there is peace. In the busy hours of life's midday so teach us to think and act and toil that we may justify the lofty pedestal of our privilege. Desiring nothing for ourselves that we do not hope for all mankind, may we strive to open for each human being the gates of an equal opportunity and an equal chance to become the best it is in him to be. Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law bring peace and prosper-